

To: Jim Walker [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
From: Dermer, Michele
Sent: Thur 6/4/2015 6:13:48 PM
Subject: RE: Lawsuit: Conspiracy by Gov. Brown, oil companies tainted aquifers : San Francisco Chronicle

I don't know where the well referred to in the lawsuit is exactly, no. All I have is the newspaper article. You could look up the lawsuit, that's public information.

As far as API numbers, I guess I missed the fundamental underlying point. If the agency that assigns API numbers is DOGGR, then of course the well would not have one since it's a Class I well. I thought there was another entity or agency that assigned those numbers. Sorry to have bothered you with the rest, I what was on the DOGGR website already. Oh well.

From: Jim Walker [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2015 11:08 AM
To: Dermer, Michele
Subject: Re: Lawsuit: Conspiracy by Gov. Brown, oil companies tainted aquifers : San Francisco Chronicle

Michele,

Thanks for forwarding this article. Do you know if the injection well cited is a Class II or I well and where it is located? This lawsuit should be very interesting and highly relevant to the overall aquifer exemption and UIC permitting activities in California.

I researched the EHP 35-18G injection well at the DOGGR website and did not find the API number or a record of the well. I suspect from reading correspondence between DOGGR and EHP in the Well Records file for the 35A-18G injection well that DOGGR decided not to assign API numbers to the 35-18G and 25-18G wells because they are Class I injection wells which DOGGR does not regulate. That policy apparently changed when the 35A-18G and 25A-18G injection wells were drilled. The correspondence (undated email) states that those wells were assigned API numbers for the purpose of tracking them when inspectors encounter them in the field and DOGGR does have well files for those two wells.

I don't know if DOGGR has well files for the wells without API numbers, but I would think so since other DOGGR correspondence with EHP in the 35A-18G file "*recommends* that that EHP contact the Division prior to any rework, plugging, and/or abandonment procedures and submit a history of any mechanical changes of the wells to the Division." The date on the latter correspondence is 12/8/2004 and is titled "Injection Well Performance Reports". The letter also states that "reporting injection data to the Division is no longer required" for the 25A-18G and 35A-18G wells because the wells are operating under a Class I permit issued by EPA.

Jim

From: [Dermer, Michele](#)

Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2015 10:48 AM

To: [Jim Walker](#)

Subject: FW: Lawsuit: Conspiracy by Gov. Brown, oil companies tainted aquifers : San Francisco Chronicle

From: Michele Dermer **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2015 9:08 AM

To: Dermer, Michele

Subject: Fw: Lawsuit: Conspiracy by Gov. Brown, oil companies tainted aquifers : San Francisco Chronicle

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

To: Mic

Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2015 7:15 AM

Subject: Lawsuit: Conspiracy by Gov. Brown, oil companies tainted aquifers : San Francisco Chronicle

I thought you might be interested in "Lawsuit: Conspiracy by Gov. Brown, oil companies tainted aquifers" from San Francisco Chronicle:

<http://sfg.ly/1KbZuXj>

Sent from my iPad